DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 958 HE 003 112

AUTHOR Hardaway, Charles W.
TITLE The Status of Women on the Faculty of Indiana State University.
INSTITUTION Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; *Feminism; *Higher Education; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors; Working Women

ABSTRACT

In recent years the role and status of women in the various professions has become a topic of much concern. Claims of unequal opportunities, discrimination, and abuse have been made, and data have been presented by numerous groups to illustrate that some of the claims of discrimination are well-founded. The purpose of this report is to present factual data as they pertain to the status of women on the faculty at Indiana State University. Such information should disclose evidences of discrimination either in employment practices or in the conditions of employment. The data are presented in tabular form in which comparisons between male and female faculty are shown. In some instances where national data or other pertinent statistics are available, further comparisons are made.

ED 062 958

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Status of Women on the Faculty of Indiana State University

Charles W. Hardaway
Vice President for General Affairs

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the role and status of women in the various professions has become a topic of much concern. Claims of unequal opportunities, discrimination, and abuse have been made; and data have been presented by numerous groups to illustrate that some of the claims of discrimination are well-founded. Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, pertaining to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs and equal employment opportunity, combined with Federal Executive Order #11375 of October, 1968, have no doubt given major impetus to the growing concern over the status of women. Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states that, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Section 703 states, in part, that, "It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer:

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex or national origin; or

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."

HE 003 112

The Federal Executive Order issued in October, 1968, made sex discrimination illegal for federal contractors and sub-contractors, and employment in federally assisted construction.

Thus, official action has been taken mandating that there be no discriminatory practices in employment and in the conditions of employment including such factors as selection, promotion, remuneration, and other benefits.

The purpose of this report is to present factual data as they pertain to the status of women on the faculty of Indiana State. Such information should disclose if there are evidences of discrimination either in employment practices or in the conditions of employment. The data will be presented in tabular form by which comparisons between male and female faculty are shown. In some instances where national data or other pertinent statistics are available, further comparisons will be made.

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Number of Faculty Women

The data pertaining to the number of faculty women employed at Indiana State University for the past six years are presented in Table I. All full-time regular and one-year faculty are reported, including those at the Evansville Campus, those on fiscal year appointments and those on coaching contracts. However, administrative personnel holding academic rank and the professional librarians are not included in this aspect of the study.

Table I
Number and Per Cent of I.S.U. Faculty by Sex, 1965-1970

Academic Year	Male		Female	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1965-66	374	75.3	123	24.7
1966-67	454	77.2	134	22.8
1967-68	497	75.2	164	24.8
1968-69	564	74.2	196	25.8
1969-70	627	75.8	200	24.2
1970-71	642	75.8	205	24.2

Table I discloses that approximately 24 per cent of the faculty are women and that this percentage has been somewhat consistent throughout the past six years. According to data reported by the American Association of University Women, "Nationally women comprise 22 per cent of the faculty . . . " If these data are reliable, it appears that Indiana State employs an appropriate percentage of women to the faculty. A study conducted by the AAUP Committee on the Status of Women at Indiana University (January, 1971), reveals that for the past three years (1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70) the percentage of women on the I.U. faculty was 10.2, 10.1 and 10.6, respectively. This comparison with our sister institution thus reveals that our employment practices with reference to women faculty are much closer to expectations than those at Indiana University.

Table II shows the number of male and female faculty members on the basis of school and department. An examination of the Table reveals that 13 departments have no women faculty members. However, four of these departments are in the School of Technology and one is the Department of Physical Education for Men. It is reasonably assumed that no women would normally be employed in these departments. On the other hand, two units, the School of Nursing and the Department of Physical Education for Women, have only women faculty; this, too, is a reasonable expectation. One department which might normally be expected to employ women only, namely Home Economics, has two men on its faculty. In terms of College and Schools, it is noted in Table II that the percentage of women faculty are as follows:

School/College	Per Cent Women
Arts and Sciences	19
Business	29
Education	36
Health, P.Ed., and Rec.	35
Nursing	100
Technology	0
Evansville Campus	21

Table II
Number and Per Cent of I.S.U. Faculty
by Sex and Rank in Departments and Schools

SCHOOL OR COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT	Male				Female				Total by Sex		Per Cent by Sex *		Total
	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Instr.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Instr.	M	F	M	F	
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES													
Anthropology	1	2		1		1	1		4	2	67	33	6
Art	2	3	8	3					16		100		16
Chemistry	5	4	5						14		100		14
Economics	6	3	4	3		1			16	1	94	6	17
English	14	13	21	18	1	2	5	12	66	20	77	23	86
Foreign Language	2	1	8	3		1	3	2	14	6	70	30	20
Geography	8	6	7	2		1			23	1	96	4	24
History	5	4	8	2					19		100		19
Home Economics			2		3	3	7	7	2	20	9	91	22
Humanities	2	3	2	1	1		2		8	3	73	27	11
Library Science	1	1	3			3			5	3	62	38	8
Life Sciences	8	8	7			1		1	23	2	92	8	25
Mathematics	2	7	5	7				5	21	5	81	19	26
Music	5	7	10	8	1	2	2	3	30	8	79	21	38
Philosophy	3	1	3	1					8		100		8
Physics	2	5	5	5					17		100		17
Political Science	6	5	2	7			1		20	1	95	5	21
Psychology	4	4	4						12		100		12
Science Teaching Center	1		3	1		1		1	5	2	71	29	7
Social Science Educ. Cntr.	1		2						3		100		3
Sociology	3	9	3	3			1	3	18	4	82	18	22
Speech	4	4	6	6	1		4	4	20	9	69	31	29
Sub Total	85	90	118	71	7	16	26	38	364	87	81	19	451
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS													
Sub Total	5	9	8	7		4	4	4	29	12	71	29	41

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

(Table II Continued)

SCHOOL OR COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT	Male Prof.	Male Assoc. Prof.	Male Asst. Prof.	Male Instr.	Female Prof.	Female Assoc. Prof.	Female Asst. Prof.	Female Instr.	Total by Sex M	Total by Sex F	Per Cent by Sex * M	Per Cent by Sex * F	Total
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION													
Education	11	10	12				1		33	1	97	3	34
Educational Psychology	1	2	4			1	1		7	2	78	22	9
Special Education	3	5	2	1	1		1	1	11	3	79	21	14
Elementary Education	3	9	3		2	3	3	2	15	10	60	40	25
Division of Sec. Teaching	3		8	1	1				12	1	92	8	13
Laboratory School	2	1	6	16		1	11	28	25	40	38	62	65
Sub Total	23	27	35	18	4	5	17	31	103	57	64	36	160
SCHOOL OF H.P.E.R.													
Health and Safety	1	2	5	1				1	9	1	90	10	10
Physical Education for Men		6	17	6					29		100		29
Recreation	1	1	2	1					5		100		5
Physical Education for Women					2	1	10	9		22		100	22
Sub Total	2	9	24	8	2	1	10	10	43	23	65	35	66
SCHOOL OF NURSING													
Sub Total						1	6	5		12		100	12
SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY													
Industrial Arts	2	1	3	1					7		100		7
Industrial Professional Educ.	1	3	4						8		100		8
Industrial Technology	1	6	11	2					20		100		20
Vocational Technology	3	4	5	2					14		100		14
Sub Total	7	14	23	5					49		100		49
EVANSVILLE CAMPUS Sub Total		11	25	18		3	4	7	54	14	79	21	68
GRAND TOTAL	122	160	233	127	13	30	67	95	642	205	75.8	24.2	847

The AAUP Committee conducting the Indiana University study on the status of women made the assumption that the proportion of women obtaining terminal degrees was indicative of the number of women available for employment in the various subject matter fields. If this assumption is valid, then a comparison of the percentage of women on the faculty with the percentage of women receiving terminal degrees in the various areas might be evidence of discrimination in employment practices. Such a comparison is made with the data presented in Table III. It should be noted that terminal degree data on the national level are not available for all areas; for example; no data were reported in the technology or nursing areas. Two other factors should also be mentioned. Terminal degree data show that women attained about 18 per cent of all terminal degrees during the ten-year period (1959-1968), no doubt all attaining terminal degrees did not enter or remain in the profession. Also, a significantly large percentage of women currently employed do not hold terminal degrees.

Accepting these variables, the data in Table III would indicate that five departments do not have the proportion of women faculty members that might reasonably be expected if national criteria relating to supply are applied. These departments are Art, History, Music, Philosophy, and Psychology. On the other hand, the Departments of Anthropology, Library Science, Mathematics, and Speech as well as the Schools of Business and Education exceed the proportions of women employees that might be anticipated.

An interesting and significant aspect of employment practices at Indiana State concerns the number of husband-wife combinations on the faculty. The official policy, in this regard, permits the employment of both husband and wife as long as one is not within the organizational line of authority or scope of supervision of the other; also not more than one member of a family may be employed in the same functional working unit. For the 1970-71 academic year, there are thirty-seven instances in which

Table III
Comparison of Percentages of Women
in I.S.U. Departments with National Percentages
of Women Attaining Terminal Degrees

I.S.U. Department or School	Percent* Women (I.S.U.)	Percent* Women Receiving Terminal Degrees, (U.S.) 1958-68***	Difference
Anthropology	33	21	+12
Art	0	40	-40
Chemistry	0	6	- 6
Economics	6	5	+ 1
English	23	22	+ 1
Foreign Languages	30	30**	--
Geography and Geology	4	3	+ 1
History	0	11	-11
Home Economics	91	95	- 4
Library Science	38	25	+13
Life Science	8	13	- 5
Mathematics	19	6	+13
Music	21	51	-30
Philosophy	0	11	-11
Physics	0	2	- 2
Political Science	5	8	- 3
Psychology	0	19	-19
Sociology	18	16	+ 2
Speech and Theater	31	16	+15
Business	29	4	+25
Education	36	19	+17
HPER	35	28	+ 7

* Percentages reported to the nearest whole per cent.

** Percentage figure derived by combining data representing areas of Classical Studies, French and Italian, Germanic Languages, and Spanish and Portuguese.

*** Data reported in "Study of the Status of Women Faculty at Indiana University," AAUP Committee on the Status of Women, January, 1971 (Bloomington, Indiana). Source: U.S. Office of Education, Earned Degrees Conferred.

husband and wife hold full-time faculty appointments (including librarians). There are an additional four instances in which the wife holds academic rank and the husband is employed in an administrative role.

Service of Women on Committees and in Administrative Roles

The appointment and participation of women on faculty and university committees is an indication of the role and status of women relative to university governance and policy making. The data pertaining to the ratio of women on elected and appointed committees for the period 1965 through 1970 are presented in Table IV.

Table IV
Composition of Faculty Committees at
Indiana State University, 1965-70

Year	Faculty Council/Senate		Faculty Committees		University Committees*	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1965	10	2	59	10	76	17
1966	11	1	62	7	99	19
1967	10	2	58	8	114	20
1968	9	3	53	11	133	23
1969	10	2	60	12	137	26
1970	32	8	59	13	140	30
Total	82	18	351	61	699	135
Per cent	82.0	18.0	85.2	14.8	83.8	16.2

* Includes both faculty and administration members.

Table IV reveals that during the past six year, 18 per cent of the Faculty Council/Senate membership has been comprised of women; that women represented 15 per cent of the membership of the faculty committees; and that the membership of the University Committees included 16 per cent women. In each case, the percentage of women on the various types of committees falls below the 24 per cent figure, the

proportion of women on the faculty. It might be feasible to note at this point the manner of selection of these three groups. Faculty Council/Senate members are elected from the faculty by the faculty. Faculty committee members are nominated by the Committee on Committees (1965-1969) and/or by the Executive Committee (1970). The nominations are taken from committee preference forms submitted by faculty members desirous of serving on various committees. The University committees are comprised of administrative officials appointed by the President by virtue of their areas of responsibility and of faculty members nominated by the Committee on Committees or by the Executive Committee. Again, faculty members are nominated and selected on the basis of stated committee preferences. On the surface it appears that women are not being elected or appointed to the various committees in proportion to the number of women on the staff. However, the data are not available to show the number of women who indicated a desire to serve in committee activities. It may well be that in terms of those expressing a desire to serve on committees, a larger proportion were actually nominated for such service. Perhaps this aspect of committee participation warrants further study.

Although this study is designed primarily to show the status of women faculty, it seems pertinent at this point to include also the status of women relative to administrative responsibility. A number of administrators hold faculty rank and a significant portion of these have moved from the faculty to accept administrative responsibility. This portion of the study is limited to those administrators with faculty rank and provides the data for the past three years as follows:

Year	Number & Per Cent of Administrators with Academic Rank* Classified on the Basis of Sex			
	MALE		FEMALE	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1968-69	38	90.5	4	9.5
1969-70	39	86.7	6	13.3
1970-71	43	86.0	7	14.0

* These data do not include Department Chairmen.

The percentage of women with academic rank holding administrative positions is currently fourteen. The seven positions are:

Dean of the School of Nursing
Dean of Summer Sessions and Academic Services
Associate Dean of Student Life
Assistant Dean, School of Graduate Studies
Assistant Dean, School of Nursing
Director, Academic Enrichment and Learning Skills Center
Assistant to the Director, Academic Enrichment and Learning Skills Center

Status of Women Faculty Relative to Tenure, Promotions, Publications, and Leaves of Absenc

Tables V through IX present comparative data for men and women faculty members in the areas of tenure, promotions, publications, and leaves of absence. The data are generally available for the past six years and are reported to show the number and per cent, by sex, for each of the four factors for this period.

Table V
Number and Per Cent of Faculty Attaining Tenure
for the Period 1965 through 1971

Academic Year	ACADEMIC RANK									
	Professor		Assoc. Prof.		Assist. Prof.		Instructor		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1965-66			4		18	3	4	4	26	7
1966-67			5	3	13	2	4	2	22	7
1967-68	4	0	9	1	26	2	3	3	42	6
1968-69	9	0	11	3	19	8	8	5	47	16
1969-70	4	0	16	2	22	6	10	8	52	16
1970-71	7	1	7	1	24	4	14	11	52	17
1971-72	7	0	13	4	31	4	11	13	62	21
Total	31	1	65	14	153	29	54	46	303	90
Per Cent *	97	3	82	18	84	16	54	46	77	23

* Percentage reported to the nearest whole per cent.

Table V shows that 393 faculty members were granted tenure status since the 1965-66 academic year. Of this number, 90 or 23 per cent, were women faculty members. This percentage figure approximates the 24 per cent of the faculty comprised of women. A comparison of attainment of tenure status on the basis of academic rank is also in order. In recent years the percentage of faculty by sex and by rank has been as follows:

Rank	Male Per Cent	Female Per Cent
Professor	89	11
Assoc. Professor	86	14
Assist. Professor	78	22
Instructor	57	43

A comparison of these percentages with those showing attainment of tenure in Table V reveals that with the exception at the rank of professor, there is close relationship between the number and sex at each rank and those attaining tenure. The discrepancy at the full professor rank is possibly explained by the fact that since 1966, an appointee at the rank of professor has been required to serve a one-year probationary period before becoming eligible for tenure. Most of the appointments at the full professor level since this date (largely Department Chairmen and Distinguished Professors) have been men.

The data pertaining to faculty promotions for the period 1965-66 through 1970-71 are presented in Table VI.

For the six-year period, 1965-66 through 1970-71, a total of 227 faculty members have received promotions in academic rank. Of those receiving promotion, 48 or 21 per cent, were women. Again this percentage approximates the 24 per cent of women on the faculty. The percentage of women attaining the rank of associate and full professor, 16 and 15 per cent respectively, slightly exceeds the percentage of women at these two ranks, 14 and 11 per cent. However, the 39 per cent of women promoted to the rank of assistant professor significantly exceeds the per cent of women holding that rank (22).

Table VI
Number and Per Cent of Faculty Promotions
by Rank and Sex, 1965 - 1970

Academic Year	LEVEL OF PROMOTION							
	Assist. Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Professor		Total (227)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1965-66	3	3	14	1	11	1	28	5
1966-67	8	1	9	1	6	2	23	4
1967-68	4	5	21	4	2	2	27	11
1968-69	3	5	13	1	11	0	27	6
1969-70	7	3	14	5	8	2	29	10
1970-71	8	4	22	6	15	2	45	12
Totals	33	21	93	18	53	9	179	48
Per Cent *	61	39	84	16	85	15	79	21

* Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole per cent.

Promotion data reporting the number receiving such recognition do not in themselves reveal the total picture. The number eligible for promotion, the number applying for promotion and the number denied promotion must also be given due consideration before further, more complete analyses can be made.

The information pertaining to the number of promotion applications submitted and considered is available for the past four years. These data together with the number of applications approved are presented in Table VII.

A total of 387 promotion applications were submitted during the past four years. Of these, 309, or 79.8 per cent, were filed by male faculty members whereas 78, or 20.2 per cent, were filed by female applicants. Fifty per cent of all applications from the women faculty members were approved compared to 41.4 per cent being approved for the male faculty members. Nearly 74 per cent of all women applications to the rank of assistant professor were approved whereas only 47 per cent of the male applications at this rank were approved. At the other two professorial ranks, the percentages of approved applications were comparable for men and women faculty members.

Table VII
Number and Per Cent of Faculty
Applying for and Receiving Promotion, 1967-68 through 1970-71

Academic Year	Number Applying for Promotion		Number and Per Cent Receiving Promotion			
	Male	Female	Male	Per Cent	Female	Per Cent
			PROFESSOR			
1967-68	27	5	2		2	
1968-69	31	2	11		0	
1969-70	24	8	8		2	
1970-71	51	7	15		2	
Sub Total	133	22	36	27.1	6	27.3
			ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR			
1967-68	39	8	21		4	
1968-69	26	6	13		1	
1969-70	25	8	14		5	
1970-71	39	11	22		6	
Sub Total	129	33	70	54.3	16	48.5
			ASSISTANT PROFESSOR			
1967-68	6	9	4		5	
1968-69	12	6	3		5	
1969-70	13	3	7		3	
1970-71	16	5	8		4	
Sub Total	47	23	22	46.8	17	73.9
Grand Total	309	78	128		39	
Per Cent				41.4		50.0

Among the factors generally considered in promotions are degrees held, experience, service, quality of performance and research and publication. Each year the University, through the efforts of the Office of the Academic Vice President and the Library staff, distributes a pamphlet entitled, "Faculty Publications." Faculty publications, including books, periodicals, articles, reviews, poetry, arrangements

and dissertations, completed and published during the year are listed in this pamphlet. Assuming that the listings are complete, then a comparison of the number of publications by sex should be one index of professional activities. Such data are presented in Table VIII.

Table VIII
Number and Per Cent of Faculty Publications
By Sex, 1965-66 through 1969-70

Publication Year	Number of Publications	
	Male Faculty	Female Faculty
1965-66	177	35
1966-67	256	48
1967-68	232	23
1968-69	218	24
1969-70	238	52
Total (1,303)	1,121	182
Per Cent	86.03	13.97

Table VIII reveals that 86 per cent of the publications reported by the faculty for the past five years were authored by male faculty members, whereas only 14 per cent were prepared by women.

Data pertaining to leaves of absence for the six-year period, 1965-66 through 1970-71, are presented in Table IX. Leaves are granted either with or without pay, depending upon eligibility for sabbatical, and may be for the academic year or for one of the two semesters.

The data included in Table IX reveal that for the past six years only 14.2 per cent of the leaves with pay have been granted to women as compared to 85.8 per cent to the men. Such a difference would appear to indicate that there is some evidence of discrimination relative to the issuance of leaves with pay. However,

Table IX
Leaves of Absence of I.S.U. Faculty on the Basis of Sex, Type of Leave, Duration of Leave, 1965-1970

Academic Year	Duration of Leave	Type of Leave								Totals	
		With Pay				Without Pay					
		Male	Sub Total	Female	Sub Total	Male	Sub Total	Female	Sub Total	Male	Fe
1965-66	1st Sem.	9		0		0		1			
	2nd Sem.	4		3		1		0			
	Acad. Yr.	5	(18)	2	(5)	5	(6)	1	(2)	24	
1966-67	1st Sem.	9		3		1		0			
	2nd Sem.	7		1		1		0			
	Acad. Yr.	1	(17)	2	(6)	8	(10)	2	(2)	27	
1967-68	1st Sem.	8		1		2		0			
	2nd Sem.	7		0		0		0			
	Acad. Yr.	5	(20)	1	(2)	6	(8)	1	(1)	28	
1968-69	1st Sem.	10		0		1		0			
	2nd Sem.	13		1		0		0			
	Acad. Yr.	2	(25)	0	(1)	7	(8)	5	(5)	33	
1969-70	1st Sem.	7		2		2		1			
	2nd Sem.	9		3		2		3			
	Acad. Yr.	6	(22)	3	(8)	12	(16)	5	(9)	38	
1970-71	1st Sem.	15		0		0		0			
	2nd Sem.	15		0		2		0			
	Acad. Yr.	7	(37)	1	(1)	10	(12)	3	(3)	49	
Totals			139		23		60		22	199	4
Per Cent			85.8		14.2		73.2		26.8	81.6	18

it should be pointed out, that with the exception of leaves requested for the 1968-69 academic year, practically all eligible applicants have been granted leaves with pay during the period under study. (For the 1968-69 year, nine male and four female faculty members who applied for leaves with pay were denied this benefit). Thus it can perhaps best be concluded that a smaller percentage of elgible women faculty apply for leaves with pay. Leaves without pay are granted essentially automatically upon application; the exception being, perhaps, when a suitable replacement is not available. The percentage of women receiving leaves without pay, 26.8 per cent, closely approximates the proportion of women on the faculty.

Faculty Salaries, 1970-71

This portion of the study presents faculty salary data for the 1970-71 academic year. Comparisons are made between salaries paid to male and female faculty members on the basis of rank and on the basis of other selected factors which have a direct bearing on salaries. Such factors include extent of training (degrees held), date of receipt of doctoral degree, age, and length of employment at Indiana State. Included in this aspect of the study are data for all full-time faculty (regular and one-year) who are paid on an academic year base. Thus, data pertaining to department chairmen are incorporated into the study. However, data pertaining to administrators holding faculty rank, faculty members on a fiscal year salary base, and faculty holding coaching contracts are excluded. With these exclusions, the numbers of faculty (by rank) included in the salary data are as follows:

Rank	Male		Female	
		Dept. Chrm.		Dept. Chrm.
Professors	120*	(29)	13*	(2)
Assoc. Professors	158*	(9)	30	
Asst. Professors	217		65	
Instructors	123		95	

* These figures include the number of department chairmen shown in parentheses.

Table X presents the average salary on the basis of rank and sex for the 1970-71 academic year together with other descriptive data for the faculty at each rank.

Table X
Average Salary by Rank and Sex
for the 1970-71 Academic Year

	Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Instructors	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Number	120	13	158	30	217	65	123	95
Average Salary	$17,837	$17,086	$14,203	$13,984	$11,600	$11,289	$9,097	$8,788
Salary Difference	+ $751		+ $219		+ $311		+ $309	
Excluding Chairman:								
Number	91	11	149	30				
Average Salary	$17,599	$16,784	$14,144	$13,984				
Salary Difference	+ $851		+ $160					
Training:								
No. with Doctorate	114	13	127	25	80	20	2	0
Per cent:* Doctorate	95	100	80	83	37	30	2	0
No. 3-yr. Grad	2		18	3	57	9	15	4
Per cent:*3 yr. Grad	2		11	10	26	14	12	4
No.: 2 yr. Grad or less	4		13	2	80	36	106	92
Per cent:*2 yr. Grad or less	3		8	7	37	55	86	97
Average Year Doctorate Earned	1956	1960	1964	1966	1968	1969		
Ave. No. Yrs. at ISU	11	15	6	8	3	5	2	2
Average Age	51	54	43	45	37	43	31	34

* Percentages are reported to the nearest whole number.

The basic findings as contained in Table X are enumerated as follows:

1.) The average salary of male faculty members at all ranks is higher than that for the corresponding female faculty members. The salary differences range from $751 at the full professor rank to $219 at the associate professor rank. When data for department chairmen are excluded, the difference increases at the professor rank ($815) and decreases at the associate professor rank ($160).

2.) A slightly larger percentage of the women faculty hold doctorate degrees than do the men at the professor and associate professor ranks. At the rank of assistant professor and instructor, a larger percentage of the males hold the doctorate degree. For the entire faculty; however, 323 of the 618 male faculty members (52.3 per cent) hold the doctorate compared with 58 of the 203 women faculty members (28.6 per cent).

3.) On the average, at each rank, the male faculty members have held the doctorate for a longer period than is the case for the women faculty members. The difference is four years at the professor rank, two years at the associate professor rank, and one year at the assistant professor rank.

4.) At each rank, with the exception of the instructor level, the women on the average have been employed at Indiana State for a longer period than have the men.

5.) The women are older on the average than the men at each rank. The differences in ages range from 6 years at the assistant professor rank to two years at the associate professor rank.

The differences between salaries of male and female faculty members at each rank can, perhaps, be attributed to two factors. Generally speaking, the male faculty members have held their doctorates for a longer period than the females and/or have attained a higher level of training. More extensive publication, combined with a greater likelihood to apply for leave to improve one's professional status may have also contributed to the salary differences. It is also worthy to note that the salary differences which are revealed in Table X are less than salary differences

between the sexes that have been shown in studies conducted on other campuses.

It should be stressed at this point that the data presented in Table X are based on averages. Averages are generally the most reliable statistics for showing "group descriptions;" however, such measures will tend to hide "individual extremes" or other significant differences. Too, it should be noted that the numbers of cases included in the study at each rank are not comparable on the basis of sex. For instance, 13 female professors are compared with 120 male professors. Similar differences exist at the ranks of associate and assistant professor. Such differences in numbers might result in distortion of the findings which would not necessarily be revealed in the "averages."

To off-set this possibility, it was felt advisable to match the subjects at each rank and to report the findings on the basis of matched pairs. In other words, the 13 female professors were matched with 13 male professors who possessed similar characteristics. Criteria for matching included age, degree, date of degree and date of employment at Indiana State.

As might be expected, it was impossible to find matching pairs which had identical data on the four criteria. Age, degree and date of degree became the prime factors with date of employment at I.S.U., a secondary factor. Again, perfect matching was impossible. Thus, an attempt was made to use pairs in which the variables were matched as closely as possible and then select the pairs where the differences would tend to off-set one another or "average out." The effect of this is noted in each of the following five tables when averages are compared.
Table XI, for example, shows that the average date of birth of the thirteen pairs at the full professor level is 1917, and the pairs have been employed at I.S.U. on the average since 1954. However, it was impossible to match date of degree precisely. The men in the thirteen pairs had earned their doctorates five years, on the average, prior to their women counterparts.

Table XI reveals that the average salary of the 13 women full professors is $17,086 compared to $16,787 for the men full professors, a difference of $299. The difficulty in precise matching might well contribute to such a difference. Table XII shows that at the associate professor level, the salary for the thirty women is $13,984 compared to a salary of $13,932 for the thirty men having similar characteristics. The data for the matched pairs at the assistant professor level are presented in Tables XIII and XIV. Table XIII presents the data for those assistant professors holding the doctorate degree, whereas Table XIV presents the data for assistant professors with less than doctorate level training. The salaries for the men assistant professors holding the doctorate compared to the matched group of women is $12,139.47 to $11,755.26, a difference of $384.21. However, for the men assistant professors not holding the doctorate (Table XIV), the average salary is $11,106.55 as compared to $11,129.76 for the matched group of women. The salary data for the matched pairs at the instructor level are presented in Table XV. (In selecting the pairs at this level, every fourth woman on an alphabetical list was selected for inclusion in this portion of the study and was matched with a male faculty member with similar characteristics.) The data in Table XV show that the average salary for the men is $8,707.26 compared to $8,650.81 for the women, a difference of $56.45.

A careful analysis of the data presented in Tables XI through XV reveals a number of significant findings. In the first place, the differences in average salaries are minimal and are probably chance differences. In some cases, the females have higher salaries than the corresponding males, and in other cases the reverse is true. Secondly, the differences in salaries are just as great within the sex groups as they are between the sex groups. Finally, it seems evident that salary differences are based on factors other than sex.

Table XI
Comparison of Salaries of Male and Female Professors
on the Basis of Pairs Matched by Age, Date of Receipt of Doctorate
Degree, and Date of Employment at I.S.U.

Pairs (N=13)	Female Professors				Male Professors			
	Date of Birth	Date of Ph.D. or Ed.D.	Date of Employment	Salary	Date of Birth	Date of Ph.D. or Ed.D.	Date of Employment	Salary
A	1906	1950	1939	$18,275	1909	1937	1938	$17,825
B	1921	1961	1963	$16,200	1921	1958	1959	$15,550
C	1922	1950	1963	$16,800	1923	1949	1956	$16,400
D	1923	1964	1964	$15,275	1927	1956	1964	$15,775
E*	1908	1959	1930	$19,000	1905	1934	1946	$20,000
F	1931	1962	1963	$15,500	1932	1963	1962	$14,625
G	1916	1963	1955	$16,250	1916	1960	1956	$17,725
H	1917	1964	1950	$18,100	1917	1953	1946	$17,875
I	1919	1959	1960	$16,100	1919	1969	1962	$15,575
J	1923	1964	1965	$15,450	1926	1963	1960	$16,200
K	1909	1955	1948	$17,900	1907	1959	1959	$15,425
L	1909	1952	1954	$18,775	1909	1948	1957	$17,000
M*	1914	1960	1943	$18,500	1914	1961	1946	$18,250
Ave.	1916.7	1959.7	1954	$17,086	1917	1955	1954.6	$16,787

* Indicates Department Chairman

Table XII
Comparison of Salaries of Male and Female Associate Professors
on the Basis of Pairs Matched
By Age, Date of Receipt of Doctorate Degree, and Date of Employment at I.S.U.

Pairs (N=30)	Female Associate Professors				Male Associate Professors			
	Date of Birth	Date of Ph.D. or Ed.D.	Date of Employment	Salary	Date of Birth	Date of Ph.D. or Ed.D.	Date of Employment	Salary
A	1924	1966	1970	$15,500	1924	1964	1967	$14,700
B	1931	1962	1965	14,125	1931	1963	1963	14,000
C	1927	1965	1965	13,850	1927	1964	1969	12,850
D	1926	1957	1963	14,025	1927	1958	1965	14,800
E	1922	1959	1968	14,100	1922	1963	1967	14,550
F	1932	1963	1965	12,700	1932	1962	1968	13,900
G	1938	1965	1965	14,975	1938	1962	1963	14,050
H	1932	1967	1960	14,300	1931	1963	1964	14,100
I	1926	1967	1970	15,500	1926	1960	1960	14,475
J	1935	1968	1968	13,500	1936	1966	1967	13,600
K	1926	1963	1960	14,925	1926	1967	1967	14,500
L	1927	1967	1959	13,650	1927	1963	1966	13,525
M	1927	1965	1966	12,300	1928	1965	1966	14,350
N	1923	1966	1962	13,850	1923	1965	1964	14,725
O	1923	1966	1964	13,375	1923	1963	1963	13,900
P	1912	M.S.	1947	12,250	1906	2 Yr.	1937	12,550
Q	1925	1962	1968	14,675	1925	1959	1964	14,100
R	1933	1969	1968	15,525	1933	1966	1968	13,925
S	1929	1968	1962	14,200	1929	1968	1968	14,550
T	1933	1963	1966	13,275	1933	1964	1968	14,225
U	1917	1967	1969	14,450	1916	1966	1959	14,175
V	1925	1966	1966	13,300	1924	1966	1968	14,100
W	1911	1965	1968	13,850	1910	1967	1970	12,500
X	1921	1967	1962	14,125	1921	1969	1964	13,300
Y	1920	3 Yr.	1955	14,125	1923	3 Yr.	1953	14,700
Z	1931	1968	1958	13,975	1931	1967	1965	13,175
AA	1921	3 Yr.	1955	13,450	1917	3 Yr.	1946	13,875
BB	1932	1969	1970	14,600	1931	1964	1965	13,700
CC	1920	3 Yr.	1948	13,275	1918	3 Yr.	1949	14,125
DD	1909	2 Yr.	1943	13,775	1907	2 Yr.	1943	12,925
Average	1925.3	1965.2	1962.5	$13,984	1924.8	1964.2	1962.2	$13,932

Table XIII
Comparison of Salaries of Male and Female Assistant Professors Holding Doctorate Degrees on the Bases of Pairs Matched by Age, Date of Receipt of Degree, and Date of Employment at I.S.U.

Pairs N=19	Female Assistant Professors				Male Assistant Professors			
	Year of Birth	Year of Ph.D.	Year of Employment	Salary	Year of Birth	Year of Ph.D.	Year of Employment	Sala
A	1936	1969	1969	$11,775	1936	1969	1969	$12,1
B	1929	1970	1970	$11,500	1929	1968	1970	$12,5
C	1922	1970	1965	$12,900	1923	1966	1967	$12,6
D	1928	1968	1967	$11,375	1928	1968	1969	$12,8
E	1936	1968	1965	$11,975	1935	1969	1970	$11,5
F	1942	1970	1970	$10,500	1943	1970	1970	$12,0
G	1920	1967	1970	$11,000	1919	1969	1965	$12,6
H	1936	1967	1970	$12,500	1936	1967	1970	$11,8
I	1922	1970	1970	$12,800	1920	1969	1969	$12,5
J	1924	1969	1966	$12,250	1928	1968	1969	$12,8
K	1939	1968	1970	$10,500	1939	1969	1968	$11,9
L	1932	1970	1970	$10,250	1933	1969	1969	$11,7
M	1939	1967	1967	$12,400	1940	1967	1968	$11,6
N	1940	1969	1965	$12,400	1940	1969	1969	$11,5
O	1930	1970	1970	$10,800	1933	1969	1970	$11,2
P	1933	1968	1967	$12,750	1933	1969	1967	$11,7
Q	1926	1970	1965	$12,100	1926	1970	1963	$13,6
R	1935	1969	1969	$11,775	1933	1968	1968	$11,5
S	1931	1967	1962	$11,800	1931	1964	1967	$12,2
Average	1931.6	1968.7	1967.7	$11,755.26	1931.8	1968.8	1968.3	$12,139

Table XIV
Comparison of Salaries of Male and Female Assistant Professors, with Less than Doctoral-Level Training, on the Basis of Pairs Matched by Age, Level of Training, and Date of Employment at I.S.U.

Pairs 1-42	Female Assistant Professors Not Holding Doctorate Degrees				Male Assistant Professors Not Holding Doctorate Degrees			
	Date of Birth	Level of Training	Date of Employment	Salary	Date of Birth	Level of Training	Date of Employment	Salary
A	1938	3 yr.	1968	$11,625	1937	3 yr.	1967	$11,425
B	1928	3 yr.	1967	$11,025	1928	3 yr.	1965	$11,600
C	1919	3 yr.	1968	$10,925	1920	3 yr.	1956	$12,800
D	1931	3 yr.	1969	$10,875	1931	3 yr.	1965	$10,650
E	1942	3 yr.	1969	$10,325	1942	3 yr.	1970	$ 9,500
F	1932	3 yr.	1964	$11,000	1934	3 yr.	1966	$ 9,800
G	1932	3 yr.	1958	$12,525	1932	3 yr.	1959	$11,475
H	1931	3 yr.	1964	$11,350	1931	3 yr.	1963	$11,575
I	1943	3 yr.	1970	$10,200	1943	3 yr.	1970	$10,000
J	1922	2 yr.	1965	$10,425	1921	2 yr.	1962	$10,700
K	1912	2 yr.	1946	$12,000	1913	3 yr.	1968	$14,300
L	1907	2 yr.	1963	$12,175	1911	2 yr.	1961	$10,575
M	1940	2 yr.	1965	$10,200	1942	2 yr.	1964	$ 9,725
N	1909	2 yr.	1959	$12,500	1910	2 yr.	1963	$10,775
O	1926	2 yr.	1970	$11,000	1928	2 yr.	1962	$10,350
P	1919	2 yr.	1957	$12,725	1921	2 yr.	1947	$13,150
Q	1939	2 yr.	1964	$10,300	1937	2 yr.	1964	$ 9,850
R	1909	2 yr.	1962	$10,925	1908	2 yr.	1964	$11,450
S	1920	2 yr.	1968	$10,675	1929	2 yr.	1961	$10,925
T	1909	2 yr.	1951	$13,150	1911	3 yr.	1965	$12,450
U	1925	2 yr.	1957	$11,675	1927	2 yr.	1959	$11,125
V	1927	M.F.A.	1969	$ 9,625	1929	M.F.A.	1970	$ 9,750
W	1917	M.Ed.	1968	$10,300	1917	M.S.	1957	$11,175
X	1919	M.A.	1965	$12,150	1918	M.S.	1956	$12,225
Y	1916	M.S.	1965	$11,900	1921	M.Ed.	1956	$11,175
Z	1939	M.A.	1970	$10,500	1940	M.A.	1970	$ 9,700
AA	1934	M.A.	1967	$10,925	1935	M.S.	1964	$10,[illegible]
BB	1913	M.M.	1962	$10,750	1913	M.A.	1968	$10,[illegible]
CC	1928	M.S.	1968	$10,750	1929	2 yr.	1970	$10,[illegible]
DD	1923	M.A.	1965	$10,700	1923	M.B.A.	1968	$10,600
EE	1913	M.A.	1970	$11,200	1911	M.P.H.	1970	$12,500
FF	1925	M.S.	1957	$10,775	1926	M.A.	1961	$10,700
GG	1935	A.M.	1967	$13,950	1936	M.S.	1968	$11,400
HH	1930	M.A.	1965	$11,050	1928	M.S.	1965	$11,500
II	1932	M.S.	1966	$10,950	1932	M.S.	1969	$10,700
JJ	1914	M.A.	1947	$11,775	1914	M.S.	1957	$12,000
KK	1933	M.N.	1970	$11,000	1933	M.S.	1970	$11,500
LL	1928	M.S.	1969	$ 9,125	1925	M.A.	1968	$10,950
MM	1938	M.A.	1969	$ 9,550	1938	M.A.	1967	$10,950
NN	1930	M.S.	1963	$10,475	1924	M.F.A.	1964	$10,500
OO	1907	M.S.W.	1966	$11,650	1909	M.A.	1968	$12,575
PP	1927	M.S.	1962	$10,750	1927	M.A.	1966	$11,175
Ave.	1925.3		1964.1	$11,129.76	1925.8		1964.1	$11,106.55

Table XV
Comparison of Salaries of Male and Female Instructors
on the Bases of Pairs Matched by Age, Level
of Training and Date of Employment at I.S.U.

Pairs N=31	Female Instructors				Male Instructors			
	Date of Birth	Level of Training	Date of Employment	Salary	Date of Birth	Level of Training	Date of Employment	Salary
A	1916	M.S.	1970	$ 8,200	1920	M.S.	1967	$ 9,150
B	1924	M.S.	1968	$ 7,400	1923	M.S.	1966	$ 9,000
C	1936	M.S.	1969	$ 8,475	1937	M.S.	1969	$ 9,000
D	1935	M.S.	1967	$10,300	1936	M.M.	1969	$10,700
E	1933	M.S.	1969	$ 9,250	1931	M.S.	1968	$10,900
F	1947	B.A.	1969	$ 7,050	1943	B.A.	1969	$ 6,950
G	1944	M.S.	1967	$ 8,650	1944	M.A.	1968	$ 9,025
H	1948	B.A.	1970	$ 7,000	1943	B.S.	1970	$ 7,500
I	1945	M.S.	1968	$ 9,900	1945	M.S.	1969	$ 7,750
J	1945	M.A.	1970	$ 7,200	1945	M.A.	1969	$ 7,500
K	1942	M.A.	1970	$ 9,850	1941	M.S.	1967	$ 9,550
L	1943	M.S.	1969	$ 8,125	1943	A.M.	1968	$ 9,075
M	1939	3 yr.	1967	$ 9,700	1942	3 yr.	1970	$ 9,700
N	1921	M.B.A.	1970	$10,500	1922	M.Ed.	1966	$ 8,925
O	1944	B.S.	1970	$ 7,500	1946	B.S.	1970	$ 7,000
P	1938	M.S.	1969	$ 8,000	1939	M.S.	1968	$ 7,475
Q	1945	M.S.	1969	$ 7,500	1945	M.S.	1968	$ 8,000
R	1947	M.A.	1970	$ 8,000	1946	M.A.	1970	$ 8,000
S	1935	2 yr.	1964	$ 9,625	1936	2 yr.	1969	$ 9,625
T	1936	M.S.	1967	$ 9,525	1939	M.A.	1969	$ 9,100
U	1929	M.A.	1969	$ 9,275	1927	2 yr.	1966	$ 9,300
V	1947	M.S.	1970	$ 6,900	1947	M.S.	1970	$ 7,500
W	1943	M.S.	1967	$ 8,050	1942	M.M.	1968	$ 8,100
X	1933	M.S.	1969	$ 8,000	1935	M.S.	1969	$ 9,000
Y	1927	M.S.	1969	$10,775	1925	M.S.	1967	$ 9,725
Z	1938	M.S.	1968	$ 8,575	1939	M.S.	1968	$ 9,000
AA	1933	M.S.	1966	$ 8,650	1932	M.S.	1967	$ 8,050
BB	1933	M.S.	1968	$ 9,150	1931	M.S.	1968	$ 9,350
CC	1936	M.A.	1967	$ 9,650	1936	M.A.	1967	$ 8,475
DD	1925	M.S.	1969	$ 9,100	1925	M.A.	1970	$ 9,000
EE	1941	M.M.	1970	$ 8,300	1943	M.A.	1970	$ 8,500
Ave.	1937		1968.5	$8,650.81	1937		1968.4	$8,707.26

8200
7200
5850
8900
6900
8300
6 | 48450
8040

8200
7500
9900
8150
33000
8250

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Findings

The data presented herein have provided information relative to the status of the faculty women at Indiana State University. Areas studied include employment practices and opportunities and conditions of employment. A summary of the principal findings is enumerated as follows:

1. Approximately twenty-four per cent of the full time faculty at Indiana State University are women. This figure is slightly higher than national figures pertaining to women in higher education.

2. Thirteen of the academic departments at Indiana State currently employ no women faculty. Five of these departments (in Technology and Men's Physical Education) would not normally be expected to employ women.

3. The percentage of women faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences is nineteen; at the Evansville Campus the percentage of women is twenty-one. The faculties of all the other schools (excluding Technology) are comprised of 29 per cent or more women.

4. In terms of available supply, the Departments of Art, History, Music, Philosophy and Psychology do not employ a proportionate share of women faculty members. The Departments of Anthropology, Library Science, Mathematics and Speech; the School of Business and the School of Education exceed the proportions of women faculty members that might be anticipated.

5. Employment opportunities are open to both husband and wife on the faculty of Indiana State. Presently, there are thirty-seven married couples on the faculty.

6. During the past six years, women have comprised 18 per cent of the membership of the Faculty Council/Senate, nearly 15 per cent of the faculty committee

membership and over 16 per cent of university committee membership.

7. Fourteen per cent of the University administrators holding academic rank are women.

8. Since 1965-66, 23 per cent of those receiving tenure have been women. This figure closely approximates the 24 per cent of the faculty comprised of women.

9. Twenty-one per cent of all promotions during the past six-year period have been granted to women. The percentage of applications for promotion by women during this same period was 20.2. However, 50 per cent of the applications by women were approved compared to 41.4 per cent for the male faculty members.

10. Of the 1,303 publications reported by the faculty since 1965, 1,121 (86.03 per cent) have been authored by men compared to 182 (13.97 per cent) by women faculty members.

11. Since 1965-66, 14.2 per cent of the leaves granted with pay have been extended to women compared to 85.8 per cent being approved for men. It should be noted; however, that with the exception of one year, all eligible applicants for leaves with pay have been accorded the requested leave. During this same period, women have been granted 26.8 per cent of the leaves without pay compared to 73.2 per cent to the men.

12. Overall average salary comparisons between male and female faculty on the basis of rank provide the following:

Rank	No. Male	Ave. Salary	No. Female	Ave. Salary	Difference
Professor	120	$17,837	13	$17,086	$751
Associate Professor	158	$14,203	30	$13,984	$219
Assistant Professor	217	$11,600	65	$11,289	$311
Instructor	123	$ 9,097	95	$ 8,788	$309

It is noted that overall salary comparisons by rank show that the men receive a higher average salary than the women at each rank. It should be noted; however,

that the men have held their doctorates on the average for a longer period than the women and that at the lower ranks, their level of training exceeds that of the women.

13. When the salary comparisons are made on the basis of matched pairs at each rank, the following findings are evident:

Rank	No. of Pairs	Average Salary for Men	Average Salary for Women	Difference
Professor	13	$16,787	$17,086	+ $299
Associate Professor	30	$13,932	$13,984	+ $ 52
Assistant Professor				
With Doctorate	19	$12,139	$11,755	- $384
Without Doctorate	42	$11,106	$11,129	+ $ 23
Instructor	31	$ 8,707	$ 8,650	- $ 57

In view of the difficulty of obtaining identically matched pairs, these differences would appear to be chance differences rather than sex differences inasmuch as there is no consistent pattern of differences.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of faculty women at Indiana State University. Data were presented and analyzed as they pertained to employment practices and conditions of employment. On the basis of the findings the following conclusions and recommendations are submitted:

1. The opportunity for employment of women for faculty positions at Indiana State is favorable and employment practices reveal no direct evidences of discrimination. This statement is supported by the fact that the percentage of faculty women exceeds the national percentage figure of women in higher education and by the fact that many academic units of the University employ a higher percentage of women than would reasonably be expected in terms of supply based on terminal degrees in the respective areas. Also, the data indicate that faculty wives are readily employed providing they have the necessary training and experience.

However, certain academic units do not employ a proportionate number of women in relation to estimates of available supply. These units should be encouraged to seek qualified women applicants and to fill positions with such individuals until more appropriate ratios between the sexes are attained.

2. The conditions of employment at Indiana State University appear to be equal or nearly equal for the sexes. There seem to be no significant differences between the sexes insofar as promotions, leaves, committee assignments and administrative roles are concerned. Where percentage differences do exist, however, in these respects, concerted efforts should be directed toward individual cases and toward removing discrepancies if, in fact, they do exist.

3. Salary differences appear to be based on factors other than sex. Level of training, date of attainment of terminal degrees and professional activities all contribute to salary level. Salary differences are as extensive within the sexes as they are between the sexes. Supply and demand, outside competition, previous salary and the extent and quality of performance at the institution, are justifiably considered in salary determination procedures. The University administration should continue to recognize excellence of service despite the subjective judgment that must enter in and despite the accusations of discrimination that might occur. In such event, an explanation and justification should be forthcoming.

4. Continuous study of the status of women should be conducted and both the administration and faculty should be alert to areas of possible discrimination. If discriminatory practices or evidence of unequal opportunities are suspected, specific attention should be directed to these situations. The University should have no hesitancy to conform to the spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.